

The Department of State

bulletin

VOL. XXV, No. 494

December 19, 1948

REPORT ON THE ACTS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST HUMAN RIGHTS

Report of the Commission on the Acts of Violence Against Human Rights	723
Report of the Commission on the Acts of Violence Against Human Rights	725

REPORT ON THE UNANIMOUS PRINCIPLE OF

Report of the Commission on the Acts of Violence Against Human Rights	723
---	-----

REPORT ON THE UNANIMOUS PRINCIPLE OF

Report of the Commission on the Acts of Violence Against Human Rights	723
---	-----

REPORT ON THE UNANIMOUS PRINCIPLE OF

Report of the Commission on the Acts of Violence Against Human Rights	723
---	-----





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XIX, No. 494 • PUBLICATION 3374

December 19, 1948

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$5, foreign \$7.25
Single copy, 15 cents

Published with the approval of the
Director of the Bureau of the Budget

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

General Assembly Adopts Declaration of Human Rights

STATEMENT BY MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT¹

U.S. Representative to the General Assembly

The long and meticulous study and debate of which this universal Declaration of Human Rights is the product means that it reflects the composite views of the many men and governments who have contributed to its formulation. Not every man nor every government can have what he wants in a document of this kind. There are of course particular provisions in the declaration before us with which we are not fully satisfied. I have no doubt this is true of other delegations, but taken as a whole the Delegation of the United States believes that this is a good document—even a great document—and we propose to give it our full support. The position of the United States on the various parts of the declaration is a matter of record in the Third Committee. I shall not burden the Assembly, and particularly my colleagues of the Third Committee, with a restatement of that position here.

Certain provisions of the declaration are stated in such broad terms as to be acceptable only because of the limitations in article 29 providing for limitation on the exercise of the rights for the purpose of meeting the requirements of morality, public order, and the general welfare. An example of this is the provision that everyone has the right of equal access to the public service in his country. The basic principle of equality and of nondiscrimination as to public employment is sound, but it cannot be accepted without limitations. My Government, for example, would consider that this is unquestionably subject to limitation in the interest of public order and the general welfare. It would not consider that the exclusion from public employment of persons holding subversive political beliefs and not loyal to the basic principles and practices of the constitution and laws of the country would in any way infringe upon this right.

Likewise, my Government has made it clear in the course of the development of the declaration that it does not consider that the economic and social and cultural rights stated in the declaration imply an obligation on governments to assure the enjoyment of these rights by direct governmental action. This was made quite clear in the Human Rights Commission text of article 23 which served as a so-called "umbrella" article to the articles on economic and social rights. We consider that the principle has not been affected by the fact that

this article no longer contains a reference to the articles which follow it. This in no way affects our whole-hearted support for the basic principles of economic, social, and cultural rights set forth in these articles.

In giving our approval to the declaration today, it is of primary importance that we keep clearly in mind the basic character of the document. It is not a treaty; it is not an international agreement. It is not and does not purport to be a statement of law or of legal obligation. It is a declaration of basic principles of human rights and freedoms, to be stamped with the approval of the General Assembly by formal vote of its members, and to serve as a common standard of achievement for all peoples of all nations.

We stand today at the threshold of a great event both in the life of the United Nations and in the life of mankind, that is the approval by the General Assembly of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recommended by the Third Committee. This declaration may well become the international Magna Carta of all men everywhere. We hope its proclamation by the General Assembly will be an event comparable to the proclamation of the Declaration of the Rights of Man by the French people in 1789, the adoption of the Bill of Rights by the people of the United States, and the adoption of comparable declarations at different times in other countries.

At a time when there are so many issues on which we find it difficult to reach a common basis of agreement, it is a significant fact that 58 states have found such a large measure of agreement in the complex field of human rights. This must be taken as testimony of our common aspiration first voiced in the Charter of the United Nations to lift men everywhere to a higher standard of life and to a greater enjoyment of freedom. Man's desire for peace lies behind this declaration. The realization that the flagrant violation of human rights by Nazi and Fascist countries sowed the seeds of the last world war has supplied the impetus for the work which brings us to the moment of achievement here today.

¹ Made on Dec. 9, 1948, and released to the press on the same date. For related material see *Progress Report on Human Rights* (Department of State pub. 3262) and *An International Bill of Human Rights* (Department of State pub. 3055).

THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

In a recent speech in Canada, Gladstone Murray said:

"The central fact is that man is fundamentally a moral being, that the light we have is imperfect does not matter so long as we are always trying to improve it . . . we are equal in sharing the moral freedom that distinguishes us as men. Man's status makes each individual an end in himself. No man is by nature simply the servant of the state or of another man . . . the ideal and fact of freedom—and not technology—are the true distinguishing marks of our civilization."

This declaration is based upon the spiritual fact that man must have freedom in which to develop his full stature and through common effort to raise the level of human dignity. We have much to do to fully achieve and to assure the rights set forth in this declaration. But having them put before

us with the moral backing of 58 nations will be a great step forward.

As we here bring to fruition our labors on this Declaration of Human Rights, we must at the same time rededicate ourselves to the unfinished task which lies before us. We can now move on with new courage and inspiration to the completion of an international covenant on human rights and of measures for the implementation of human rights.

In conclusion I feel that I cannot do better than to repeat the call to action by Secretary Marshall in his opening statement to this Assembly:

"Let this third regular session of the General Assembly approve by an overwhelming majority the Declaration of Human Rights as a standard of conduct for all; and let us, as Members of the United Nations, conscious of our own shortcomings and imperfections, join our effort in good faith to live up to this high standard."

TEXT OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

WHEREAS disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people.

WHEREAS it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

WHEREAS it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

WHEREAS the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

WHEREAS member states have pledged themselves to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

WHEREAS a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge

Now therefore

The General Assembly

Proclaims this universal declaration of human rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of member states themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 1. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

ARTICLE 2. 1. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration, without discrimination of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

2. Furthermore no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

ARTICLE 3. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and the security of person.

ARTICLE 4. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

ARTICLE 5. No one shall be subjected to torture

¹ Approved by Committee III on Dec. 6, 1948.

or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

ARTICLE 6. Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

ARTICLE 7. All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the laws. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

ARTICLE 8. Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

ARTICLE 9. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

ARTICLE 10. Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

ARTICLE 11. 1. Everyone charged with a penal offense has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defense.

2. No one shall be held guilty of any penal offense on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offense, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offense was committed.

ARTICLE 12. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

ARTICLE 13. 1. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

ARTICLE 14. 1. Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

2. This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 15. 1. Everyone has the right to a nationality.

2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

ARTICLE 16. 1. Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

2. Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

3. The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the state.

ARTICLE 17. 1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

ARTICLE 18. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

ARTICLE 19. Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

ARTICLE 20. 1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

ARTICLE 21. 1. Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

2. Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

3. The will of the people shall be the basis of authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

ARTICLE 22. Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international cooperation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each state, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

ARTICLE 23. 1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration insuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

ARTICLE 24. Everyone has the right to rest and

leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

ARTICLE 25. 1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

ARTICLE 26. 1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible on the basis of merit.

2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

ARTICLE 27. 1. Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

ARTICLE 28. Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration can be fully realized.

ARTICLE 29. 1. Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

2. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

3. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 30. Nothing in this declaration may be interpreted as implying for any states, groups or persons any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

Closing of General Assembly

*Excerpts From Statement by Ambassador
Warren R. Austin*

On the occasion of the closing of the present session of the General Assembly at Paris, I am convinced that the gains made were appreciable and real. I feel that, by reason of the debates, and the positions taken by 58 nations, the prospects for world peace have improved.

The general issue is more clearly defined to be between a bloc of Soviet States, and the great majority of Members of the United Nations, which are determined to keep their peoples free, and to preserve the blessings of liberty. It is not convincing, after repeated and consistent majority decisions with only the Communist bloc for opposing minority, to assert that the issue is between the United States and the U.S.S.R. The probability of war is reduced by the recognition and consolidation of the facts. The possibility of agreement is increased by knowledge of where we stand.

The Charter expressly bases security upon collective action, and provides for the inherent right of self-defense collectively, as well as severally. The unity by agreement of all peace-loving states in the General Assembly on all the major policies put in issue, is a condition in world politics tending to prevent aggression. This is solid gain toward pacific methods of settlement of disputes.

Ad Hoc Political Committee Resolution on Admission of New Members¹

RECALLING that eight members of the Security Council in August 1947 supported a draft resolution recommending the admission to the United Nations of Austria, at such time and under such conditions as the General Assembly might deem appropriate, but that no recommendation was made to the Assembly because of the opposition of one of the permanent members; * * * and

RECALLING resolution 113 (II) H of 17 November 1947 requesting the Security Council to reconsider the application of Austria; and

NOTING from the report of the Security Council that, since none of its members has changed its decision with regard to this application, the Security Council has adjourned its discussion on the matter indefinitely;

The General Assembly

Reiterates its opinion that Austria is a peace-loving State within the meaning of Article 4 of the Charter, and consequently

Requests the Security Council to reconsider the application of Austria, in the light of this expression of opinion of the Assembly and of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 28 May 1948.

¹ Excerpts from U.N. doc. A/AC. 24/30, Nov. 27, 1948; adopted by Ad Hoc Committee on Nov. 27.

General Assembly Adopts Convention on Genocide

STATEMENT BY ERNEST A. GROSS¹

Alternate U.S. Representative to the General Assembly

The draft convention on genocide which is now before this Assembly is the end product of two years of careful and arduous work. It will be recalled that in December 1946 the General Assembly, by unanimous vote, affirmed that genocide is a crime under international law which the civilized world condemns and for the commission of which principals and accomplices are punishable. The unanimous vote in the General Assembly on this matter in itself reflected the determination of the peoples of the United Nations, whatever their race, creed, or nationality, to assure that the barbarism which had so recently shocked the conscience of mankind would never again take place.

The General Assembly in 1946 called for the preparation of a convention on genocide which would define the offense more precisely and provide enforcement procedures for its repression and punishment. The draft of such a convention, prepared initially by an *ad hoc* committee of the United Nations, has been patiently and exhaustively discussed by the Sixth Committee of this Assembly. The United States Delegation is prepared to sign the convention, representing the fruits of the labor of the Sixth Committee and confidently hopes that all member states will do likewise.

It seems to the United States Delegation that in a world beset by many problems and great difficulties, we should proceed with this convention before the memory of recent horrifying genocidal acts has faded from the minds and conscience of man. Positive action must be taken now. My Government is eager to see a genocide convention adopted at this session of the Assembly and signed by all member states before we quit our labors here.

The denial of the right of existence of entire human groups is the subject matter with which this convention deals. The task of the legal committee has been to reduce to specific and workable terms the general objective of outlawing actions which have that purpose and effect. The convention responds to the recommendations of the General Assembly in its resolution of December 11, 1946, that international cooperation be organized between states with a view to facilitating the speedy prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. The United States Government has been one of many which have been honored to cooperate in this work. In our view, the draft convention provides a basis upon which all members of the United Nations may agree.

At the conclusion of the labors of the Sixth Committee the Delegate of the Soviet Union announced the intention of his delegation to propose upon the floor of the General Assembly amendments to the draft convention. On behalf of the United States Delegation, I voiced our concern, and indeed alarm, at this procedure. Certain delegations, including my own, which believed that improvements could be made in the draft convention prior to its final adoption by the Sixth Committee, moved the Committee for reconsideration of certain articles of the convention. Amendments to the draft were made only after the committee, by a two-thirds vote, had agreed to reconsider the points involved.

The Delegate of the Soviet Union strenuously objected when these proposals for reconsideration were made and the Soviet Delegate did not himself move for reconsideration of any of the provisions of the draft convention. The grounds upon which the Soviet Delegate objected to efforts to obtain reconsideration of certain matters in the convention were that the points had been fully debated, had been resolved by the committee, and should not be reopened. Therefore, his failure to submit any proposals for reconsideration by the committee was, I think, very properly understood by members of the committee as indicating that there were no changes in the draft convention which the Soviet Delegation desired to bring to the attention of the Sixth Committee for reconsideration and action. Accordingly, the members of the Committee, who had labored for many weeks in the preparation of the draft convention, were deprived of an opportunity to consider and debate any matters which the Soviet Delegation considered relevant to a request for reconsideration.

The United States Delegation believes, and respectfully submits to the members of the Assembly, that the course now adopted by the Soviet Delegation of proposing amendments upon the floor of the General Assembly is a procedure which is bound to have obstructive consequences. Although, of course, the Soviet Delegation is acting within its formal rights in taking this action, such a procedure threatens to reopen in the full body of the General Assembly, the whole debate upon issues which were carefully considered and re-

¹ Made before the General Assembly on Dec. 9, 1948, and released to the press on the same date. Mr. Gross is Legal Adviser to the Secretary of State.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

solved in weeks of effort in the Sixth Committee. My delegation feels that it is its duty to call this to the attention of the Assembly and to express the hope that we will not be led into reargument of these complex questions in this forum.

I conclude my remarks by again expressing the

hope that the draft convention in the form in which it has been submitted by the Sixth Committee will receive the unanimous support of all member states and that the convention will be signed prior to the rising of this part of the third regular session of the General Assembly.

RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL AND TEXT OF CONVENTION¹

The General Assembly,

Approves the annexed convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide and proposes it for signature and ratification or accession in accordance with its Article XI.

ANNEX

Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide

The contracting parties,

HAVING CONSIDERED the declaration made by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution 96 (1) dated 11 December 1946 that genocide is a crime under international law, contrary to the spirit and aims of the United Nations and condemned by the civilized world;

RECOGNIZING that at all periods of history genocide has inflicted great losses on humanity; and

BEING CONVINCED that, in order to liberate mankind from such an odious scourge, international cooperation is required;

Hereby agree as hereinafter provided:

ARTICLE I, The contracting parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

ARTICLE II, In the present convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

ARTICLE III, The following acts shall be punishable:

- (a) Genocide;
- (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;

¹ Adopted on Dec. 9, 1948 (U.N. doc. A/760, Dec. 6, 1948); printed from telegraphic text.

(c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;

(d) Attempt to commit genocide;

(e) Complicity in genocide.

ARTICLE IV, Persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials, private individuals.

ARTICLE V, The contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III.

ARTICLE VI, Persons charged with genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the state in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those contracting parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE VII, Genocide and the other acts enumerated in Article III shall not be considered as political crimes for the purpose of extradition.

The contracting parties pledge themselves in such cases to grant extradition in accordance with their laws and treaties in force.

ARTICLE VIII, Any contracting party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III.

ARTICLE IX, Disputes between the contracting parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfillment of the present convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a state for genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.

ARTICLE X, The present convention, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall bear the date of

ARTICLE XI, The present convention shall be open until 31 December 1949 for signature on be-

Department of State Bulletin

half of any member of the United Nations and of any non-member state to which an invitation to sign has been addressed by the General Assembly.

The present convention shall be ratified, and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the United Nations.

After 1 January 1950 the present convention may be acceded to on behalf of any member of the United Nations and of any non-member state which has received an invitation as aforesaid.

Instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XII, Any contracting party may at any time, by notification addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations, extend the application of the present convention to all or any of the territories for the conduct of whose foreign relations that contracting party is responsible.

ARTICLE XIII, On the day when the first 20 instruments of ratification or accession have been deposited, the Secretary General shall draw up a *procès-verbal* and transmit a copy of it to each member of the United Nations and to each of the non-member states contemplated in Article XI.

The present convention shall come into force on the 90th day following the date of deposit of the 20th instrument of ratification or accession.

Any ratification or accession effected subsequent to the latter date shall become effective on the 90th day following the deposit of the instrument of ratification or accession.

ARTICLE XIV, The present convention shall remain in effect for a period of ten years as from the date of its coming into force.

It shall thereafter remain in force for successive periods of five years for such contracting parties as have not denounced it at least six months before the expiration of the current period.

Denunciation shall be effected by a written notification addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XV, If, as a result of denunciations, the number of parties to the present convention should become less than 16, the convention shall cease to be in force as from the date on which the last of these denunciations shall become effective.

ARTICLE XVI, A request for the revision of the present convention may be made at any time by any contracting party by means of a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary General.

The General Assembly shall decide upon the steps, if any, to be taken in respect of such request.

ARTICLE XVII, The Secretary General of the United Nations shall notify all members of the United Nations and the non-member states contemplated in Article XI of the following:

(a) Signatures, ratifications and accessions received in accordance with Article XI;

(b) Notifications received in accordance with Article XII;

(c) The date upon which the present convention comes into force in accordance with Article XIII;

(d) Denunciations received in accordance with Article XIV;

(e) The abrogation of the convention in accordance with Article XV;

(f) Notifications received in accordance with Article XVI.

ARTICLE XVIII, The original of the present convention shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

A certified copy of the convention shall be transmitted to all members of the United Nations and to the non-member states contemplated in Article XI.

ARTICLE XIX, The present convention shall be registered by the Secretary General of the United Nations on the date of its coming into force.

[ANNEX] B

Resolution relating to the study by the International Law Commission of the question of an international criminal jurisdiction.

The General Assembly,

CONSIDERING that the discussion of the convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide has raised the question of the desirability and possibility of having persons charged with genocide tried by a competent international tribunal,

CONSIDERING that, in the course of development of the international community, there will be an increasing need of an international judicial organ for the trial of certain crimes under international law,

Invites the International Law Commission to study the desirability and possibility of establishing an international judicial organ for the trial of persons charged with genocide or other crimes over which jurisdiction will be conferred upon that organ by international conventions;

Requests the International Law Commission in carrying out this task to pay attention to the possibility of establishing a criminal chamber of the International Court of Justice.

[ANNEX] C

Resolution relating to the application of the convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide with respect to dependent territories.

The General Assembly recommends that parties to the convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide which administer dependent territories, should take such measures as are necessary and feasible to enable the provisions of the convention to be extended to those territories as soon as possible.

U.S. Urges Continuation of Temporary Commission on Korea

STATEMENT BY JOHN FOSTER DULLES IN COMMITTEE I¹

Acting Chairman, U.S. Delegation to the General Assembly

This committee now takes in hand the matter of securing the independence of Korea.² That is a momentous task and it is an exciting task—for it is a task of creation. Five years ago the war victors promised independence and unity to the 30 million people of Korea. But, as in other cases, the victors have not been able to redeem their promises, so the United Nations has had to take up the task.

Last year we made a good beginning. Then, this Assembly voted, 43 to 0 with 6 abstentions, to establish a United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea. It was given a mandate to consult, on our behalf, with the "elected representatives of the Korean people" and "to observe that the Korean representatives are in fact duly elected by the Korean people and not mere military appointees in Korea". The commission was also authorized to supervise the establishment of a Korean Government, on the basis of elections to a national assembly, which, in turn, would establish a national government. That government, it was contemplated, would set up its own national security forces; would dissolve all military or semi-military formations not included therein; take over the functions of government from the military commands and civilian authorities of north and south Korea and arrange with the occupying powers for the complete withdrawal from Korea of their armed forces. Thus, independence would become a reality.

The members of the commission have worked well and hard under most difficult conditions. We now have before us their reports and we have heard from their rapporteur. We also have the report of the Interim Committee regarding its consultation in February of this year with the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea.

The reports are in certain respects most gratifying. In other respects they are disheartening. The disheartening feature of the reports, to mention them first, is that in the area of Korea north of the 38th parallel, which constitutes the Soviet zone of occupation; the United Nations commission was defied. It was not permitted to "travel, observe, and consult" as the Assembly requested. It was, indeed, excluded and not allowed to assure that free elections would be held and the people of that area permitted to participate in the formation of a national government. Instead, it seems

that in the darkness of that area, closed to United Nations observation, there has been brought into being a Communist-controlled regime that asserts pretensions to govern all Korea and that threatens to back those pretensions by force and violence. Already it has incited acts of terrorism and cruelty that shock all decent people. Yet that regime, born in obscurity, in defiance of the United Nations, has been recognized by three member states: the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and is, it seems, supported morally and materially by the forces in north Korea of the Soviet Union.

It is for the Korean people a dreadful thing that after forty years of oppression from Japan, they should now be threatened with new violence and terrorism from the north. It is for the United Nations a disheartening and a disturbing fact that recommendations of this Assembly, adopted by a vote of 43 to 0, should be flouted by some of our Members. This Assembly should not, indeed it cannot, conceal the gravity of that situation, not alone for Korea, but for the United Nations itself.

That is the somber aspect of the problem. There is, however, another and brighter aspect. South of the 38th parallel, where two thirds of the Korean people reside, the United Nations commission was given every facility to travel, observe, and consult as requested by this Assembly. Furthermore, under the auspices of the commission, elections were held which constituted a magnificent demonstration of the capacity of the Korean people to establish a representative and responsible government. Despite widespread efforts to confuse and to intimidate, despite the actual murder of many would-be voters, approximately 80 percent of the eligible voters registered, and of these, approximately 95 percent cast ballots.

The result was a balanced assembly, fairly reflective of the will of the people. The government created by that Assembly is now in authority; it is consolidating its position; it is building up security forces and local constabulary; it is maintaining law and order despite the efforts of some subversive elements; it is developing the economy of the country, and in that connection it is receiving, and will continue to receive, substantial economic aid from Members of the United Nations.

¹ Made on Dec. 7, 1948, and released to the press on the same date.

² See *Korea 1945 to 1948* (Department of State pub. 3305).

In sum, there has been established a lawful government having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the United Nations Temporary Commission was able to observe and consult, and in which the great majority of the people of Korea reside. That government was based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate in that part of Korea and it is the only such government in Korea.

The United Nations can be proud of its efforts and of the response of the Korean people, who have shown that, given the opportunity, they are willing and able to help themselves.

We shall, no doubt, hear repeated last year's glowing statements about conditions in north Korea which our commission was prevented from observing. The unknown can always be made to appear glamorous, and that is perhaps why north Korea is a forbidden land so far as United Nations observation is concerned. It would, however, be irresponsible for this committee to depend upon the reports of those who refused to permit of verification by the United Nations commission sent out to Korea for that purpose. We do have data, independently verified by our United Nations commission, that show that there has now come into being, through a cooperative effort of the United Nations and the Korean people, a government under whose auspices the Korean people may at last realize their oft-promised independence and unity.

It is, of course, obvious that neither independence nor unity are yet fully achieved and the United Nations cannot consider its task completed. Further measures are required of us.

First of all, the United Nations ought to put the seal of legitimacy on what has been done under its auspices. The government of the Republic of Korea needs that in order to maintain its prestige and authority at home and abroad. It would, indeed, be unthinkable that the United Nations should in any way disown the consequences of its own creative program.

In the second place, we believe that the United Nations should continue a commission on Korea in order to help the new government of Korea to end the wartime military occupation of Korea. There ought to be an observed withdrawal of occupation forces from all Korea as soon as practical. And that withdrawal should be a reality so complete and thorough that, in fact, the Korean people are truly the masters in their own home and not ruled or terrorized by elements that take their orders from without.

In the third place, we believe that the United Nations commission should help the Korean people to reunite and to end the economic dislocations, the fears of civil war, that now gravely disturb the life of the people. As in the case of Greece, Communist elements seek, by violence, to impose their will, and there is danger that these efforts

will be supported in one form or another by neighboring Communist regimes. The presence of a United Nations commission with authority to observe will deter organized violence and tend to assure that the peoples of north and south Korea and their neighbors will, in the words of the charter, "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." We also believe the United Nations commission may be able through good offices to help break down peacefully the barrier to friendly intercourse caused by the present division of Korea.

The Governments of Australia, China, and the United States are submitting to this committee a draft resolution that, in our opinion, will enable the United Nations to move forward along these lines. I hope that that resolution will receive overwhelming support. It should, because the principle involved protects not only Korea, but all of us. The United Nations here faces a familiar pattern. We see violence, terrorism, and internal division being stimulated from without by those who hope thereby to gain international objectives.

Every non-Communist government in the world is, to a greater or lesser extent, subject to these tactics.

There is one elemental defense, and that is, through the United Nations, to evidence at least a moral solidarity with those who in violation of our Charter are subjected to such threats of violence.

A distinguished representative of one of the Communist states said a few days ago before the plenary assembly, "we know that we are hated because of our form of government." That is not the case. What are hated are the methods of coercion, terrorism, and violence that are often employed by Communist governments and taught to party members. It may be that the greatest service that the United Nations can render is to be the instrumentality for demonstrating that whenever those methods are used or threatened internationally, the rest of the world community closes ranks to prevent the success of these methods by whatever peaceful means are available either to the United Nations as an organization or to Member States acting pursuant to the Charter.

If that happens, then it may be learned that the use of force, coercion, terrorism, and violence to achieve international objectives has consequences such that those methods cease to be expedient. That, in turn, may lead all the member nations to respect their Charter undertaking to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. Therein lies, in my opinion, the greatest hope of peace. So, in the interest of Korean independence, and also in the interest of the independence of each of us, let us demonstrate here solidarity with the newly formed but already threatened Government of the Republic of Korea.

TEXT OF JOINT RESOLUTION¹

The General Assembly,

HAVING REGARD to its resolution No. 112 of November 14, 1947, concerning the problem of the independence of Korea;

HAVING CONSIDERED the report of the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea (hereinafter referred to as the "Temporary Commission"), and the report of the Interim Committee regarding its consultation with the Temporary Commission;

Mindful of the fact that due to difficulties referred to in the report of the Temporary Commission, the objectives set forth in the resolution of November 14, 1947, have not been fully accomplished; and in particular that unification in Korea has not yet been achieved:

(1) *Approves* the conclusions of the reports of the Temporary Commission;

(2) *Declares* that there has been established a lawful government (the Government of the Republic of Korea), having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the Temporary Commission was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of all Korea reside; that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea;

(3) *Recommends* that the occupying powers withdraw their occupation forces from Korea as early as practicable;

(4) *Resolves* that, as a means to the full accomplishment of the objectives set forth in the resolution of November 14, 1947, a commission on Korea consisting of ----- be established to continue the work of the Temporary Commission and carry out the provisions of the present resolution, having in mind the status of the Government of the Republic of Korea as herein defined, and in particular to:

A. Lend its good offices to bring about the unification of Korea and the integration of all Korean security forces in accordance with the principles laid down by the General Assembly in the Resolution of November 14, 1947;

B. Seek to facilitate the removal of barriers to economic, social, and other friendly intercourse caused by the division of Korea;

C. Be available for observation and consultation in the further development of representative government based on the freely expressed will of the people;

D. Observe the actual withdrawal of the occupying forces and verify the fact of withdrawal when such has occurred; and for this purpose, if it so desires, request the assistance of military experts of the two occupying powers;

(5) *Decides* that the Commission:

A. Shall, within thirty days of the adoption of this resolution, proceed to Korea, where it shall maintain its seat;

B. Shall be regarded as having superseded the Temporary Commission established by the resolution of November 14, 1947;

C. Is authorized to travel, consult and observe throughout Korea;

D. Shall determine its own procedures;

E. May consult with the Interim Committee with respect to the discharge of its duties in the light of developments and within the terms of this resolution;

F. Shall render a report to the next regular session of the General Assembly and to any prior special session which might be called to consider the subject matter of this resolution, and shall render such interim reports as it may deem appropriate to the Secretary-General for distribution to Members;

(6) *Requests* that the Secretary-General provide the commission with adequate staff and facilities, including technical advisers as required; and authorizes the Secretary-General to pay the expenses and per diem of a representative and an alternate from each of the States Members of the commission;

(7) *Calls* upon Member States concerned, the Government of the Republic of Korea, and all Koreans to afford every assistance and facility to the commission in the fulfillment of its responsibilities;

(8) *Calls* upon Member States to refrain from any acts derogatory to the results achieved and to be achieved by the United Nations in bringing about the complete independence and unity of Korea;

(9) *Recommends* that Member States and other nations, in establishing their relations with the Government of Korea, take into consideration the facts set out in paragraph (2) of this resolution.

¹ Introduced by the U.S., China, and Australia in Committee I on Dec. 6, 1948, and adopted by the General Assembly on Dec. 8, 1948 (U. N. doc. A/788).

U.S. Position on Unanimity Principle of the Charter

STATEMENT BY BENJAMIN V. COHEN IN AD HOC COMMITTEE¹

Alternate U.S. Representative to the General Assembly

The question has been raised as to the basic attitude of the United States toward the Charter. I scarcely need reaffirm that the United States stands by the Charter and that the policy of the United States is to work under the Charter and to exert every effort to make the Charter work as it was intended to work.

There are certain obligations imposed by the Charter upon all members of the United Nations, and there is no right of veto granted by the Charter which gives any member the right to qualify, evade, or violate those obligations. For example, under article 2, all members are obligated to settle their disputes by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. A permanent member of the Security Council does not avoid these obligations by casting a negative vote. The law of the Charter, and the right of members to defend the law of the Charter, cannot be nullified by a veto.

The fundamental obligations imposed by the Charter are a part of the law of nations. There may be honest differences of opinion among the members as to the application of this law, which is embodied in the Charter. But such differences must rest upon something more than the arbitrary will of a member state. The Charter in article 2 expressly requires every member to fulfil its obligations in good faith.

If a permanent member forcibly destroys the political independence of a neighboring state, would anyone seriously contend that the Charter gave that member the right to nullify the law of the Charter through exercise of the veto? The veto cannot deprive members of the right to defend themselves, nor take away the right of other members to come to their aid in defense of the Charter.

If we agree that the Charter cannot and should not be nullified by the arbitrary exercise of veto, then we should welcome and not spurn efforts to promote agreement among the permanent members as to the proper application of the law of the Charter and as to the exercise of their voting privileges. Recognizing that the standards available to govern our decisions in many cases are somewhat indefinite, the United States at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco accepted the

principle of unanimity among the permanent members as a means of developing and making more certain the law of the Charter. It was then thought impractical to make, on any other basis, many important decisions affecting international peace and security, particularly those involving obligatory participation in enforcement action.

But we accepted the principle of unanimity as a means and not an end, and we insisted that the Charter should not permit a permanent member of the Security Council to be a judge in a dispute to which it was a party. The suggestion of President Roosevelt, to which several of the Soviet speakers have referred, was an effort to reconcile the ideas advanced by the United States at Dumbarton Oaks with the unqualified acceptance of the unanimity principle urged by the Soviet Union.

We are not attempting in the joint draft resolution to alter the unanimity principle as it was incorporated in the Charter. We are trying to find ways and means of making the unanimity principle work. The working of the unanimity principle requires an honest and good faith effort on the part of the permanent members to reconcile and reduce to a minimum their differences. Such an effort should make possible agreement on those essentials necessary to vindicate our common interests in peace and security.

The unanimity principle must not be confused with the practice of veto. As the Representative of the United Kingdom has indicated, the unanimity principle is not a matter of voting but is the spirit of understanding and tolerance that makes action possible even without the need of a formal vote. The practice of veto is the very reverse of the unanimity principle. The veto does not fulfil but frustrate the unanimity principle. The veto, instead of leading to agreement and accord, heightens and aggravates differences and conflicts. It contributes to wars of nerves, cold wars, the unforeseeable situations which may get beyond the control of any of the parties and threaten the peace of the whole world.

We cannot accept the idea that, if unanimity fails, the will of one, however arbitrary, prevails over the will of many, however reasonable. We want a united front, but how, pray, can we have a united front when it is offered to us only on

¹ Made on Dec. 2, 1948, and released to the press by the U.S. Delegation to the General Assembly on the same date.

condition that we accept the will of the most intransigent member?

Much has been said in the debate of the Four Power statement at San Francisco.² This was a statement, not a contract. It was not made a part of the Charter, or adopted, or accepted by the Members when they ratified the Charter in accordance with their constitutional processes. It was not more nor less than it purported by its words to be: a statement by the Four Powers of "their general attitude toward the whole question of unanimity of permanent members in the decisions of the Security Council". If it were proper for them to make such a statement of their attitude at San Francisco, in light of their work on and study of the draft Charter, it should be equally proper for the permanent members to make a re-statement of their attitude in light of the experience derived from working under the Charter. If it would be proper for the permanent members of the Security Council to make such a statement, it is equally proper for the General Assembly to recommend to the permanent members how, in the opinion of the Assembly, in the light of experience, the principle of unanimity should be given effect in order to carry out the purposes and principles of the Charter.

The Four Power statement of San Francisco indicated that certain designated questions should be regarded as procedural. The statement made it clear that the enumeration of procedural questions which it contained was not exclusive. It is not, in our judgment, improper or inconsistent with our obligations under the Charter or under our commitments to other nations to suggest, as was suggested by the Interim Committee and as is proposed in the joint draft resolution, that the Assembly should recommend to the Security Council that designated questions which in the judgment of the Assembly are procedural should be so treated by the Security Council.

The Four Power statement indicated that it was not expected that there would arise matters of great importance on which a decision would have to be made as to whether a procedural vote would apply. Experience has shown that these optimistic expectations have not been realized. It is hoped therefore that the joint draft resolution may be of genuine assistance to the Security Council.

Reference has been made to the fact that the Four Power statement at San Francisco expresses the view that should the question arise whether or not a matter is procedural, that question should be decided by a vote of seven, including the concurring votes of the permanent members. This certainly does not preclude advance agreement as to what questions are properly deemed procedural. Nor does the statement attempt to deal with the procedure which should be followed if the perma-

nent members do not agree, as they should agree, as to whether a question is procedural or nonprocedural. The statement does not say that a question should be deemed nonprocedural when only one of the permanent members so regards it. Such a position would be indefensible.

The Four Power statement further said that it was not to be assumed that the permanent members would use their privileged vote "wilfully to obstruct the operation of the Council". This is an express recognition by the powers participating in the statement that self-restraint on the part of the permanent members may rightly be expected and that such self-restraint is necessary if the Charter is to function as it was intended. If this be true, as the United States Delegation believes, it would seem quite proper for the Assembly, in light of experience, to recommend to the permanent members that if they are unable to achieve unanimity among themselves on certain matters not immediately involving their vital interests they should agree among themselves not to exercise the veto on these matters but to accept the decision reached by not less than seven members of the Security Council.

We believe that it is proper for the Assembly to submit a list of such matters for the permanent members to consider in reaching an agreement among themselves as to the questions with respect to which they might forego the exercise of their right of veto. This part of the resolution does not limit the rights of the permanent members of the Security Council under the Charter; it is only a recommendation to them as to how their rights should be exercised by agreement among themselves. It certainly in no way amends the Charter directly or indirectly.

If the smaller powers can, as they have, subjected themselves to obey the decisions of the Security Council in matters which vitally concern them without any right of veto, surely the larger powers can agree not to use the veto on mere procedural matters or on matters which, though of substantive character, do not involve their vital interests.

The United States Delegation believed that it was necessary to make these further explanations of the joint draft resolution, and we hope that they have served also to answer the question put by the Representative of New Zealand.

Just a few more words on our preliminary reaction to the draft resolution circulated by the Soviet Union this morning. We find nothing in substance in the Soviet proposal that is not included in the third paragraph of our joint resolution regarding the need for continuing consultations among the permanent members. My Delegation is in agreement with much of the statements contained in the recitals to the draft. Certainly we should strive further to strengthen the authority of the United Nations in accordance with the prin-

² BULLETIN of June 10, 1945, p. 1047.

ciples of the Charter. All of us agree that we should combine our efforts for the development of friendly relations among nations. We are also opposed to unnecessary regulation and formalism in the activities of the organs of the United Nations. But if such expressions in the Soviet resolution are intended to belittle the efforts of the Interim Committee to develop standards and

practices which may be helpful as guides to the Security Council, we cannot agree.

We regret that we cannot share the confidence expressed in the Soviet resolution that the Security Council will function better in the future than in the past unless there is much better understanding among the permanent members as to how it should function.

The United States in the United Nations

[December 11-18]

Conciliation Commission

The General Assembly in its closing session on December 11 adopted an amended British resolution for establishment of a three-member Conciliation Commission to assist Arabs and Jews in negotiating a Palestine settlement. Vote on the proposal was 35 to 15, with 8 abstentions.

A seven-nation amendment approved before the final ballot eliminated all references in the resolution to both the original partition plan and the Bernadotte proposals as the basis for a boundary agreement.

The Soviet bloc, the Arab states, Cuba, and Afghanistan opposed the Palestine resolution. Nations abstaining were Bolivia, Burma, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, India, Iran, and Mexico.

The Commission, under the terms of a French amendment adopted on December 11, will be appointed by the Big Five powers.

The Commission will take over the work of acting Palestine mediator Bunche, and, if the Security Council so requests, the truce machinery in the Holy Land.

Israeli

Membership

Israel failed on December 17 in its effort to become a member of the United Nations when its application lacked two votes of getting the required majority of seven in the Security Council in Paris.

Five nations voted for admission of the new Jewish state. They were the United States, the U.S.S.R., the Ukrainian S.S.R., Argentina, and Colombia. Only Syria was opposed. Canada, Belgium, France, China, and the United Kingdom abstained.

The vote came after Britain had proposed that the Council postpone action on the application indefinitely. This resolution was rejected.

A French suggestion that action on the admission request be deferred for one month and a Syrian proposal that the Palestine partition problem be referred to the International Court of Justice at The Hague for a ruling also were turned down.

Ceylon

Ceylon's application for membership was vetoed in the Security Council by the Soviet Union on December 15 for the second time.

Vote on Ceylon's application was 9 to 2, with the Ukrainian S.S.R. casting the other negative vote. The same vote occurred at Lake Success on August 18 when the Soviet Union first vetoed Ceylon. This action resulted from a resolution approved by the 12 nations, among them Ceylon. Soviet argument was that there was no reason to single out Ceylon from among the nations whose membership applications have been rejected.

Refugees

The International Refugee Organization has announced that during the 16 months ending October 31, a total of 334,743 people made homeless in World War II were returned to their native lands or established in other countries in Europe or abroad.

At the end of October, 551,761 refugees were still receiving Iro care, most of them in Iro assembly centers, and an additional 153,406 refugees living outside Iro camps were getting various degrees of Iro assistance, such as aid in repatriation or resettlement and legal protection.

Human Rights Declaration To Be Publized

The U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization plans to give the widest possible publicity to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted at the recently concluded Paris session of General Assembly.

UNESCO's effort will involve not only the press and other mass means of communication, but also schools in member countries in connection with their teaching about United Nations activities.

The action was approved at the recent UNESCO conference at Beirut, Lebanon, after Assistant Secretary Allen, head of the U.S. Delegation, called attention to the Assembly's adoption of the rights declaration and emphasized its tremendous significance. Mr. Allen presented a motion urging UNESCO and its member states to help give the

widest possible dissemination of the text and to encourage publicity about the declaration's implications. The resolution was carried by acclamation.

Indonesia

The Good Offices Committee on Indonesia has reported that the outcome of recent Netherlands-Indonesian talks for settlement of their differences has served to aggravate a situation which was already grave.

In a special report from Batavia to the Security Council, made public on December 14, Goc summarized both Dutch and Republican views of the talks which led to the announcement of December 11 from The Hague that the Netherlands would proceed with plans for establishment of an interim federal government in Indonesia outside Republican areas. The Netherlands also said at that time that further negotiations under Goc auspices would be futile.

The report said that such action would greatly complicate any negotiated settlement in the Indies and could create serious unrest. It also stressed concern over the maintenance, in such circumstances, of even the present unsatisfactory level of truce enforcement.

According to the report, the Netherlands informed Goc that basis for agreement with the Republic was fundamentally lacking. Further, the Dutch held as fundamentally irreconcilable Republican and Dutch views on Netherlands sovereignty during the interim period as formulated under last January's Renville agreements.

They further held that Republican refusal to accept Dutch sovereignty had nullified Republican acceptance of proposals for a basis for settlement made last September by the Goc Delegation.

The Netherlands stated, therefore, that it would proceed to set up a federal interim government drafted on the basis of results of consultations with representatives of federal territories. It added, however, that it was leaving open the possibility of future admission of Republican-held areas.

The report also summarized Republican views which charged the Netherlands with making no serious attempt to negotiate a settlement as contrasted with Republican good will which had gone to the limit in offering concessions.

The Republicans further held that Dutch attempts to form an interim government without the Republic, together with their refusal to hold further discussions under Goc, would ignore the Renville agreements, the Goc, and statements the Netherlands Government has made before the Security Council.

The Republic also called upon the Goc to take whatever measures possible to prevail upon the Netherlands Government to come to a peaceful settlement of the dispute, while reiterating Republican willingness to consider reasonable terms.

The report, however, said that the Goc did not foresee the possibility of its bringing the two parties together in *bona fide* negotiations, in light of Netherlands statements, and added that "the committee has no confidence that even the presently unsatisfactory level of truce enforcement can be maintained as the possibility of political agreement becomes more remote. The committee can see in the present situation only an intensification of factors already making for further economic deterioration, general unrest and social upheaval. Widespread hostilities involving conflict or organized groups on a large scale might be the outcome."

ILO

The International Labor Organization's Governing Body in Geneva has added partial revision of four maritime labor conventions adopted at Seattle in 1946 to the agenda of the next ILO general conference to be held at Geneva in June 1949. By a vote of 23 to 8, it decided to reconsider the conventions on accommodation of crews, wages, hours, and manning.

Among the questions previously approved for the agenda are equal pay for men and women doing work of equal value; minimum wages for agricultural labor; vocational training of adults, including disabled persons; industrial relations, including collective agreements, conciliation, and arbitration; and cooperation between public authorities and organizations for workers and for employers.

In other actions, the Governing Body established a Committee of Social Security Experts to meet first in New Zealand early in 1950; and changed the opening date of ILO's 1949 American Regional Conference at Montevideo from March 28 to April 25, while deferring British and French requests for representation there until the next Governing Body session.

An important development of the 107th session of the Governing Body, which ended December 11, was the decision to undertake international programs in the fields of job-training, and training and moving workers from countries with manpower excesses to those with shortages. David Morse, ILO's director-general, stated that he would immediately start drawing up programs of special interest to member nations.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Report on the First Session of the General Council of IRO

BY GEORGE L. WARREN

The first session of the General Council of the International Refugee Organization met at Geneva from September 13 through September 25, 1948. Upon formal organization of the meeting, the Council elected William Hallam Tuck, of the United States, as Director-General of the International Refugee Organization. Mr. Tuck had previously served as Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission for the Iro. During its first session the General Council considered and passed resolutions for the guidance of its Secretariat on questions prepared by the Preparatory Commission, which had operated since July 1, 1947, on behalf of the Iro.

Background

On February 12, 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution recommending that the Economic and Social Council establish a committee for the purpose of examining the problem of refugees and displaced persons in all its aspects. Pursuant to this recommendation the Economic and Social Council on February 16, 1946, established by resolution a Special Committee on Refugees and Displaced Persons. The Committee met in London from April 8 to June 1, 1946, to prepare a report and draft a constitution for a United Nations specialized agency to be known as the International Refugee Organization. Pursuant to a resolution by the Economic and Social Council on June 21, 1946, a Special Committee on the Finances of the International Refugee Organization met in London during July 1946, to prepare a draft provisional budget for the first financial year of the Iro. The Economic and Social Council gave final approval of the constitution, the provisional budget, an agreement for a Preparatory Commission, and the transmittal of these documents to the General Assembly under a resolution of the Council at its third session. The constitution, the provisional budget for the first financial year, and the agreement on interim measures to be taken in respect of refugees and displaced persons were approved by the General Assembly in December 1946. The agreement on interim measures authorized a Preparatory Commission to lay the groundwork for the Iro until the Organization came into being, and to take over at its discretion the functions of UNRRA and the Intergovernmental

Committee on Refugees with respect to refugees, as these agencies were to cease activities on July 1, 1947. The following 24 governments, which signed the Constitution with or without reservations, composed the Preparatory Commission:

Argentina	Iceland ¹
Australia ¹	Liberia
Belgium ¹	Luxembourg ¹
Bolivia	Netherlands ¹
Brazil	New Zealand ¹
Canada ¹	Norway ¹
China ¹	Panama
Denmark ¹	Peru
Dominican Republic ¹	Philippine Republic
France ¹	United Kingdom ¹
Guatemala ¹	United States ¹
Honduras	Venezuela

The constitution of the Iro was not to come into force until at least 15 states, whose required contributions to part I of the operational budget as set forth in annex II of the constitution totaled not less than 75 percent of the total thereof, had become parties to it. The Secretary-General of the United Nations declared the entry into force of the constitution of the Iro on August 20, 1948, when the fifteenth government presented its ratification of the Constitution. The total percentage of the governments' contributions to the operational budget on that date was 75.96 percent. In consequence, the Preparatory Commission at its final meeting in September 1948 convened the first session of the Iro on September 13, 1948, at Geneva.

Participation

The following member governments were represented at the first session of its General Council:

Australia	Luxembourg
Belgium	Netherlands
Canada	New Zealand
China	Norway
Denmark	United Kingdom
Dominican Republic	United States
France	Venezuela ²
Guatemala	

¹ Each of these Governments had deposited its ratification of the Constitution with the Secretary-General of the United Nations as of Aug. 20, 1948.

² Word was received on Sept. 13, 1948, that Venezuela had deposited its ratification of the constitution with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, making that Government the sixteenth member of Iro.

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

Not represented: Iceland.

Official observers representing Brazil,³ Italy, Ireland, Switzerland, the Holy See, the United Nations, ILO, and WHO were present. Voluntary agencies and the press were also represented.

The Council was addressed at its opening meetings by Dr. Von Steiger, Chief of the Department of Justice and Police, Bern, Switzerland; Mr. H. Laugier, Assistant Secretary of the United Nations in Charge of Social Affairs; Mr. Boris Shiskin, Labor Adviser of the Economic Cooperation Administration in Europe; Mr. Paul Ruegger, President of the International Committee of the Red Cross; the Honorable Humphrey Mitchell, Canadian Federal Minister for Labor; and Mr. Ugo Carusi, Chairman of the United States Displaced Persons Commission.

Organization of the Session

Mr. Henri Ponsot (France) was elected Chairman of the Council. Dr. Wu Nan-Ju (China) and Dr. P. J. de Kanter (Netherlands) were elected First and Second Vice-Chairman respectively. Mr. J. Schneider (Belgium) was elected Rapporteur. Representatives of those states signatories to the constitution which have not yet ratified their signatures were invited to sit at the Council table as observers and to take part, without vote, in the debates of the Council. The observers from the Governments of Italy and Switzerland indicated the interest of their governments in becoming members of the IRO.

The following nine member governments were elected by the Council to membership on the Executive Committee for two years: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, France, Norway, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela.

The United States Delegation

Presidential appointments for the first session of the IRO General Council were: Ambassador Lewis W. Douglas, United States Representative; Mr. Goldthwaite H. Dorr and Mr. George L. Warren, Alternate Representatives. In the absence of Ambassador Douglas, who was unable to attend the session, Mr. Dorr headed the Delegation. Mr. Dorr and Mr. Warren were assisted by Mr. Robert L. Fisher of the Department of the Army; Mr. Alex E. Squadrilli of the Displaced Persons Branch, Civil Affairs Division, EUCOM, Heidelberg; Colonel H. T. Brotherton, Chief, Internal Affairs and Displaced Persons Division, USFA, Vienna; and Miss Eleanor A. Burnett, Administrative Assistant.

³ The Government of Brazil is a signatory to the constitution, but not a member of the organization. The Representative of Brazil had been an active participant in the deliberations of the Preparatory Commission.

Resolutions

The following decisions were among those arrived at by the Council which adopted a total of 30 resolutions at its first session:

1. *Repatriation*: The Council instructed the Director-General to pursue his efforts to ensure the speedy repatriation of all displaced persons who expressed the wish to be repatriated. Each displaced person will continue to be given the opportunity to decide in complete freedom and after receiving full knowledge of the facts, including information supplied by the government of his country of origin, whether or not he wishes to be repatriated. Refugees and displaced persons choosing to return to their countries of origin from the Western zones of Germany and Austria will be given a twenty-day supply of food by IRO as an aid in reestablishment in their home countries.

2. *Resettlement*: In order to resettle approximately 725,000 displaced persons by June 30, 1950, and reduce to a minimum the number of persons who, at the end of the organization's operation, will constitute the non-resettleable hard core, which will require special assistance, the IRO Council instructed the Director-General to approach receiving countries again in order to secure acceptance, not only of displaced persons who will be economic assets, but also of the dependent, aged, and physically handicapped members of their families, and of orphans and other persons without family ties. Stress was also laid on the necessity for receiving intellectuals among the refugees and displaced persons and the importance of permitting these groups to continue to follow their professions in the country of reception.

3. *IRO Budget*: The Council adopted a budget of \$4,797,800 for administrative expenses and \$150,229,258 for operational expenses (except for large-scale resettlement expenses) for the fiscal year July 1, 1948-June 30, 1949. Governments were asked to make every effort to provide voluntary contributions to large scale resettlement expenses. For the succeeding fiscal year (July 1, 1949-June 30, 1950) the Council adopted a budget of \$4,500,000 for administrative expenses and \$150,060,500 for operational expenses (except for large-scale resettlement expenses). These budgets were based on the assumption that by June 30, 1950, the IRO would have repatriated or resettled 825,000 persons. It was recognized that a non-resettleable hard core estimated at 184,000 would remain for whom provision must eventually be made.

4. *Limitations on Care and Maintenance*: IRO will admit new applicants for care and maintenance only if hardship would result were the applicant denied care. This policy continues that laid down by the Preparatory Commission's

Department of State Bulletin

"freeze order". Its continuance was considered necessary by the General Council in view of the limits of the budget of the Organization and the Executive Secretary's estimate that 120,000 eligible refugees and displaced persons would request care and maintenance from the Organization if the freeze order were lifted. The Council instructed the Director-General to accord the most liberal interpretation feasible to the term "hardship".

5. *Standards of Care and Maintenance*: A resolution passed by the Council on standards of care and maintenance directed that a diet "necessary to maintain standards of health approved by medical and nutritional authorities" be provided. The Council considered that the diet of the local population in countries where Iro camps are located has now improved sufficiently to permit Iro to maintain adequate food standards without providing a differential as between displaced persons and the local population.

6. *Volksdeutsche*: The Council, after study of a report by its working committee, deferred for future consideration the question of the acceptance as eligible for Iro assistance of several hundred thousand Volksdeutsche in Austria.

7. *International Tracing Service*: The Council asked the Director-General to continue the present activities of the International Tracing Service and instructed him to consider how the tracing of missing persons could be transferred to another organization after the termination of the Iro. The Council also asked the Director-General to coordinate the work of the International Tracing Service with regard to tracing and search of children with the child-welfare programs of the Organization as a whole, and to take appropriate steps for the issuance of notifications of death.

8. *Arab Refugees from Palestine*: One of the most difficult problems facing the General Council was that of the plight of Palestinian refugees. Recognizing the necessity for assistance to such refugees, but recognizing that the resources of the International Refugee Organization are completely inadequate to permit it to relieve their distress, the Council approved the action of the Director-General in the loan of the services of the Director of Supply and Transport to the United Nations Mediator and requested the Director-General to inform the Executive Committee promptly of any action taken by the General Assembly of the United Nations pertaining to assistance to refugees in the Middle East or of any request for any other form of assistance which the Mediator might make to Iro, with a view to enabling the Executive Committee to consider whether any further assistance might be practicable within the

budgetary and constitutional limitations of the Iro.

The Council also adopted resolutions which:

Established the headquarters of the organization at Geneva;

Adopted the rules of procedure as submitted by the Preparatory Commission;

Approved the draft agreement between the Iro and the United Nations;

Transferred the property of the Preparatory Commission to the Iro;

Adopted financial and staff regulations.

The Executive Committee of the International Refugee Organization met again on December 7, 1948, in Rome. The next session of the General Council is scheduled to convene on or about March 29, 1949, in Geneva.

IRO Preparatory Commission: Seventh Session

The Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization met for the seventh part of its first session on Friday, September 10, 1948, in Geneva, concluded its activities, and adjourned on September 11, 1948. Of the 24 member governments the following 15 were represented at the meeting:

Australia	Guatemala
Belgium	Luxembourg
Brazil	Netherlands
Canada	New Zealand
China	Norway
Denmark	United Kingdom
Dominican Republic	United States
France	

The Secretary-General of the United Nations had declared the entry into force of the constitution of the Iro on August 20, 1948. Fifteen governments members of the United Nations had adhered to the constitution of the Iro prior to that date, and the total of their percentage contributions, 75.96 percent, to the operational budget slightly exceeded the 75 percent requirement of the constitution.

In consequence of the announcement of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Preparatory Commission convened the first session of the General Council of the Organization for September 13, 1948, at Geneva. The Preparatory Commission also approved staff and financial regulations for the consideration of the General Council, adopted a provisional agenda for the first session of the Council, and took other necessary steps for bringing the Organization into effective operation.

U.S. Suspends Consideration of Proposal for Japanese Deconcentration of Finances and Industry

STATEMENT BY GENERAL FRANK R. MCCOY¹

U.S. Representative on the Far Eastern Commission

Some months ago, my Government suspended its participation in discussions in the Far Eastern Commission of a United States policy proposal which was then under active consideration in the Commission. This proposal, designated as FEC 230,² presented an extremely detailed plan for the implementation of a general policy which already had been stated in existing directives to the Supreme Commander. That policy, which called for the dissolution of certain Japanese combines and a widening in the distribution of the income and ownership of Japanese industry, was then and continues to be, in the view of my Government, a fundamental objective of the occupation.

The action of the United States in suspending consideration of its proposal, however, has led to certain questions among the members of this Commission and among the Japanese people. The purpose of this statement is to clarify the position of the United States with respect to FEC 230.

Since the very first weeks of the occupation, the Supreme Commander has devoted a considerable part of the time and resources of his staff to the problem of reorganizing the financial and industrial institutions of Japan. This program which has been based upon the Post-Surrender Directive issued December 6, 1945, and on the Far Eastern Commission's own Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan, was designed to make possible the early development of democratic and peacefully inclined economic institutions in Japan. To bring about that result, plans were immediately developed and put into effect to dissolve the control of Japanese finances and industry which rested in the hands of a few powerful Japanese families.

As a part of this program, the Supreme Commander directed the Japanese Government to adopt various laws and to create certain governmental bodies charged with the responsibility of undertaking a major reorganization of the ownership and control of Japanese industry. In the brief span of three years substantial progress has been made by these bodies. The assets of the 56 persons who comprised the heads of the 10 major

Zaibatsu families and the assets of the 83 holding companies controlled by these persons have been acquired by the Government and are in process of being sold to the Japanese public. A much larger number of companies have been compelled to divest themselves of holdings in and control over smaller enterprises. Such control was exercised through intercorporate stockholdings, interlocking directorates, and similar devices. Contractual arrangements to which these Japanese enterprises were parties which had the effect of placing the control of production or trade in the hands of such enterprises have been declared void. The innumerable control associations through which Japanese enterprises exercised their collective authority are being liquidated. Action is being taken and is well-advanced toward reorganization of former savings banks, trust companies, and governmental banking institutions, making possible the emergence of a significant number of new commercial banks, to compete with and supplement the few large banking combines which formerly dominated Japanese credit sources. Finally, some scores of Japanese companies whose present state may constitute a threat to competitive enterprise are being scrutinized, one by one. Where necessary, these combines will be subjected to such reorganization as may be required to remove the existing threat.

To insure that the dispersion of economic control which is developing from these measures will not likely be reversed in the years to come, substantial revisions have been effected in the basic economic legislation of Japan. To begin with, an antitrust law has been adopted and a Fair Trade Commission set up to enforce the law. In general, the law seeks to restrain the development of new combines, excessively large or powerful, by outlawing agreements which restrain production or trade, by placing limitations upon intercorporate stockholdings, interlocking directorates, and similar devices for the concentration of corporate control, and by setting up procedures and penalties for the enforcement of these provisions. Other legislation now requires Japanese corporations to make considerably more information available to their stockholders and the public than heretofore has been the case and generally requires the management of corporations to adhere to much higher

¹ Made to the Commission on Dec. 9, 1948, and released to the press on the same date. General McCoy is chairman of the Commission.

² Not printed.

standards of public responsibility in the managements of their enterprise.

Moreover, many existing laws which tended to centralize the control of Japanese industry within a small group have been abrogated outright. Others have been modified drastically. The Fair Trade Commission and other Government agencies are analyzing still other Japanese laws to eliminate provisions which confer special privilege or tend to restrain or eliminate competition. Various laws relating to the conduct of Japanese banking have been placed under particularly careful scrutiny. One of the principal objectives of the revision of Japanese banking laws is to create a climate in which the undesirable prewar concentration of Japanese credit in a few hands could not recur.

In all this, the Japanese Government has demonstrated a commendable ability to comprehend Allied objectives and has cooperatively fulfilled its obligations. The Japanese Fair Trade Commission has prosecuted a significant series of cases against Japanese businessmen who were violating one provision or another of the statutes which seek to prevent new concentrations of Japanese industry. The Japanese Holding Company Liquidation Commission has made a careful study of the structure of the larger Japanese combines and, in close cooperation with the Supreme Commander, is currently developing plans for such reorganization of these combines as may be needed.

As the occupation and the economic situation have developed, there has been a corresponding evolution in the deconcentration program. For example, it has proved possible and desirable to dissolve most of the wartime control associations. As new sources of credit have been created through the conversion of other financial institutions to commercial banks, it has been possible to reconsider the need for the actual dissolution, once believed necessary, of Japan's biggest banks which under earlier circumstances had dominated the credit structures of Japan. With the daily growth of indication that the Japanese propose to enforce their fair trade laws vigorously and effectively, it has been possible to reconsider the standards to be used in the dissolution of some of the combines still existing. These changes in emphasis have been responsive to changing circumstances and have represented relatively minor alterations in a program which basically remains unchanged. That program, adhering to the broad purposes of the directive of the Far Eastern Commission, seeks to achieve in Japan an economic climate conducive to the development of a democratic society. It seeks to prevent the resurgence of economic power in the hands of a few who recognize no

responsibility to the Japanese people or the world at large.

When the United States suspended its participation in the discussion of FEC 230 in the Far Eastern Commission, that decision was based upon the growing realization that the guidance for the Supreme Commander and the Japanese envisaged therein had largely been overtaken by events. The major points of procedure set out in that document already had been implemented in Japan. Other details believed necessary to the accomplishing of the major objectives either had been faithfully adopted or had become unnecessary or inappropriate. Useful as the paper might have been at an earlier stage of the occupation, that usefulness no longer appeared to exist.

That the paper has become outmoded in so brief a period is a singular tribute to SCAP and the Japanese Government. Procedures which it was thought would take years to carry out in many cases have been accomplished in a matter of months. Major technical obstacles have been overcome and the demonstrated determination of the Supreme Commander to carry the program through has elicited a gratifying degree of cooperation from the Japanese themselves. Accordingly, upon a careful resurvey of the deconcentration program now well-advanced in Japan, the United States now believes that, as a practical matter, there is no need to lay down policies for the guidance of the Supreme Commander with respect to any remaining significant aspect of the program. Indeed, to do so in the outmoded terms in which FEC 230 is cast might well do more harm to the program than good. Hence, the United States has withdrawn its support of FEC 230 as a proposal upon which the Far Eastern Commission could act with benefit to the occupation.

This does not mean that the deconcentration program has been completed. Considerable amounts of securities still remain in the hands of the Government and must be disposed of. Ingenuity and vigor must be brought to this task. Existing banking legislation will undoubtedly be elaborated and refined in consonance with the objectives of this program. Those remaining Japanese combines whose existence may constitute a threat to competitive enterprise will, where necessary, be reorganized as required to remove such threat. But these programs no longer call for the development of policy. They call largely for a practical application of judgment, energy, and enterprise in implementing a program whose philosophy and objectives are clearly understood by the Supreme Commander and the Japanese Government, as they have already convincingly demonstrated.

Conduct of Trade With Japan¹

1. In so far as is compatible with the Basic Post Surrender Policy for Japan (approved 19 June 1947, and forwarded to the Supreme Commander on 26 June 1947) and other policy decisions of the Far Eastern Commission, including this policy decision, Japan's foreign trade should be so conducted as to:

a. foster the development and balanced growth of Japanese foreign trade to a level consistent with Japan's peaceful needs as defined by the Far Eastern Commission;

b. encourage an increase in Japanese exports:

(1) in order that these exports may, as soon as possible, pay for the imports required for the prevention of disease and unrest within Japan, and for the reestablishment of a self-sustaining economy; and

(2) in order that Japan may participate in providing goods for international trade;

c. insure competitive conditions in trade free of contracts or arrangements which limit access to markets or foster monopolistic controls, and prevent excessive concentration of economic power in Japan and monopolies in Japanese foreign trade, whether with the participation of Japanese or foreign capital.

2. In addition to Allied trade representatives whose entry into Japan has been or may be approved consequent upon policy decisions of the Far Eastern Commission, persons in the following categories should be permitted to enter and reside in Japan in accordance with regulations established by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers:

a. Merchants and other traders (including representatives of commercial organizations, Governmental or otherwise) who are prepared to purchase or to make arrangements for future purchases of potential exports, or to provide raw materials or other commodities which Japan must import;

b. Representatives of banks, insurance companies, airlines, shipping and other companies who are prepared to render necessary services in connection with Japan's foreign trade either to private non-Japanese businessmen, to the Supreme

Commander for the Allied Powers, or to Japanese persons or agencies approved by him;

c. Representatives of companies or individuals who had prewar property interests in Japan, the renewed operation of which would contribute to the accomplishment of the objectives in paragraph 1;

d. Representatives of companies or individuals who had substantial prewar property interests in Japan, for the purpose of inspection of those interests.

3. Nothing in this policy decision is to be understood as requiring the reopening or operation of factories in Japan.

4. There should be no discrimination against any foreign trade representatives or businessmen in Japan and all should be accorded equality of opportunity to transact business. Accommodations should be allocated to such persons entering Japan under the provisions of this policy decision on an impartial basis.

5. Yen acquired by foreign nations through activities envisaged in this policy should be useable for local expenditures in accordance with laws and regulations enforced in Japan.

6. The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers may impose port and service charges upon foreign vessels entering Japanese ports for commercial purposes with the exceptions enumerated below:

a. No port charges should be imposed on vessels entering Japanese ports in so far as they are carrying occupation force cargo or are engaged in the removal of reparations or restitution goods. Where vessels are also engaged at the same time in normal commercial operations, port charges should be imposed in proportion to the bulk of commercial cargo carried.

b. All port charges on commercial vessels as well as the services rendered to commercial vessels in Japanese ports should be subject to appropriate and non-discriminatory payment in any foreign exchange useful for the purchase of imports for Japan or in local currency, in accordance with laws and regulations enforced in Japan.

7. The persons referred to in paragraph 2 should be afforded opportunity for direct access to individual Japanese firms of their own choosing, and should have the opportunity to move freely in Japan subject only to availability of transport and accommodations. Any regulations pertaining to the participation of firms or government agencies, whether Japanese or foreign, in foreign

¹ Policy decision approved by the Far Eastern Commission on Nov. 18, 1948, and released to the press by the FEC on Dec. 6, 1948. A directive based upon this decision has been forwarded to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for implementation.

trade should be non-discriminatory in character and confined to measures essential to achieving the principles and objectives set forth in this policy and should be based upon criteria established by and under the supervision of SCAP.

8. Foreign trade may be conducted by the Japanese Government or agency thereof to the extent

deemed by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers to be necessary for the purpose of maximizing export proceeds or for other purposes, consistent with the principles and objectives stated in this policy.

9. An exchange rate for the yen should be established as soon as practicable.

Travel Abroad of Japanese Commercial Representatives¹

1. During the period of the occupation it is recognized that the operation of the private trade of Japan with other countries must be conducted largely through foreign nationals traveling or residing in Japan. However, in order to widen the scope of trade and to further the policy of preventing Japanese monopolies in foreign trade, a limited resumption of private trade contacts by the travel of Japanese commercial representatives abroad may, subject to the approval of the country of destination, be permitted under the following conditions:

a. Such travel should give Japanese no advantage over foreign nationals doing business with or in Japan. To this end foreign nationals in Japan should be given maximum freedom to develop trade, subject only to the economic controls required by reason of the occupation. Such controls should apply equally to Japanese and foreign nationals.

b. Japanese commercial representatives abroad should not be the sole sales or purchasing medium for Boeki Cho or for Japanese trade associations nor should they be allowed to be official representatives of SCAP.

c. The specific travel authorized herein and the extent thereof should be only that essential to

raise Japan's foreign trade to a level consistent with her peaceful needs as defined by the Far Eastern Commission.

d. The activities of Japanese commercial representatives abroad should be confined to trade. They should not be a cover for other activities such as for instance those of a political or propaganda nature.

e. Japanese commercial representatives should be carefully screened by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers before they are allowed to leave Japan.

2. Such Japanese travel abroad shall be under such conditions and controls as may be specified by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers and the country of destination. Subject to overall supervision by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, the Japanese Government, or any authorized agency thereof, will be responsible for the conduct of any Japanese commercial representatives permitted to travel abroad under this policy.

¹ Policy decision approved by the Far Eastern Commission on Oct. 21, 1948, and released to the press by the FEC on Nov. 9, 1948. A directive based on this decision has been forwarded to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for implementation.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

America's Answer to Communist Propaganda Abroad

BY DOUGLAS SCHNEIDER¹

Acting Chief, Public Affairs Overseas Program Staff

Between November 1918 and September 1939 most great powers in the world were, with rapidly increasing momentum, organizing the machinery for the all-out propaganda campaigns which were to be carried on throughout the war. The Fascist countries were in the vanguard, during the thirties—the prewar period—but they were rapidly joined and even overhauled by the Allies, after the outbreak of war; and, at the cessation of hostilities, almost every nation was in possession of a smoothly functioning, and in many cases quite formidable, many-voiced propaganda machine.

The U.S.A. was late in joining the chorus, but making up for lost time we too had in operation in 1945 a widespread network of information outlets—call them propaganda outlets if you wish—which under different names really blanketed the world: the “CIAA”, the so-called Nelson Rockefeller Committee on Inter-American Affairs, and the Office of War Information for all areas other than the Americas.

We and, in varying degrees, almost all other countries had the instruments at hand for the spreading of information. The propaganda machines of our enemies had collapsed with their military establishments. But we were about to reconvert our wartime organizations into peace-serving activities. What was to be the “market”, if I may so call it, for our peacetime information service?

This “market” was a paradoxical one. On the one hand there was a vast demand for information and on the other hand there had never been a stronger resistance against propaganda as such. Let me elaborate: The demand was great because of the limitations imposed upon the free flow of information during the war. Even in the areas spared from occupation or battle, such as Latin America and the British Commonwealth of Nations, news and many of the other traditional media for the dissemination of information had been restricted by censorship and by lack of physical facilities, such as newsprint or shipping space for books. In many parts of the world,

less favored, news and information had been restricted to what the enemy, Germany, Japan, and Italy, had been willing to allow to the occupied areas and to what the Allies had been able to supply despite totalitarian bans, sometimes an impressive amount, sometimes a tantalizing trickle. Curiosity was excited by the years of darkness. When the lights went on again people all over the world wanted to know; they wanted to know what had happened in the free nations during the years they were cut off. They wanted to know how the Great Powers lived, those Great Powers which had brought about the downfall of their oppressors. The flow of Allied armies round the world increased that curiosity. After having seen American G-I's by the hundreds and thousands, people everywhere wanted to find out “what made them run”, what were the homes behind those fun-loving, kind, rough, and generally unpredictable American soldiers and sailors. And over and above the general interest there were the specialists: doctors thirsted for information on the latest techniques; scholars were eager to resume their contacts with other scholars; writers with other writers. Never had there been a more eager audience.

The peoples of the world, in August 1945, were on the one hand eager for information but, on the other hand, they had in almost every case been surfeited with a glut of propaganda, often heavy-handed and, in the case of enemy-occupied territories, generally resented. After four years of Goebbels' outpouring, the Frenchman was hypersensitive to anything which even smacked of propaganda; tired of Mussolini's rantings, cynical Romans shrugged off anything with a “message” and in areas far less sophisticated than these, a very keen sense of smell had been developed.

There, then, is the scene: a world avid for information, but very generally sceptical, hard to persuade, easily “scared away”. How, in particular, did the Communist movement throughout the world seek to exploit the reservoir of good will filled to overflowing by the victorious Soviet armies and by the sacrifices of the Russian people?

First of all there were, to be sure, the traditional (if one may use the term for a relatively modern activity) the traditional media of information open to any country: the press, radio,

¹ Address delivered at the Institute on World Affairs, Riverside, Calif., on Dec. 6, 1948, and released to the press on the same date.

the motion picture. Soviet Information Bureaus issued, and still issue, to the local papers and publications their news bulletins and editorial excerpts from the Soviet papers. Powerful transmitters send out from Russia short-wave radio programs in many languages. Documentary shorts and full-length feature films show the most flattering picture of the Soviet Union. The scale of these efforts is impressive and I wish that I were able to give you some idea of the amount of men and money involved in such output. This I am, unfortunately, unable to do. I think I can tell you what British Information Services spent in France in a given year for information and cultural activities. In 1946, for instance, according to my best estimate the British must have spent approximately \$440,000 and engaged in such work some 50 British subjects. I might add that when I asked my "opposite number" at the Soviet Embassy what his government spent in France for information and cultural relations, Mr. Vidiassov answered with a wide grin, "Ah, Mister Schneider, it is no mystery but *of course* I cannot tell you!"

I might also add, as a parenthesis, that three or four months after calculating that the British had spent on information and cultural relations about \$440,000 in 1946 and after having estimated that the Russians must have spent ten times as much (a wild guess to be sure), I learned that our United States appropriation for 1947/48 (July 1947 to July 1948) was to be approximately \$125,000.

But, in spite of the efforts of the Soviet Union, in spite of the obviously large sums of money spent by them in their overt, officially acknowledged propaganda campaign, the results of these, in so far as one may judge anything so intangible as human reactions to propaganda, seem to be mediocre. This type of Communist propaganda is heavy-handed, and except among hardened party members who need no convincing, it is often resented.

The Tass Agency's news files, the Moscow short-wave radio outpourings, the magazines and displays and exhibits, however, were but one and by no means the most skilful of the approaches to the mind and to the emotions of man.

A more novel and more attractive device was the national association known in France as "France-U.S.S.R." and in this country as "National Council of American-Soviet Friendship", different names for different countries but always essentially the same pattern.

May I give you some idea of the association "France-U.S.S.R.", with which I was quite familiar. It is a local example which follows a general plan. Its aim: to promote a better understanding of the Soviet Union in France. Its directorate: generals and professors, parliamentarians, ex-ministers, scientists of world-wide reputation. And its methods? Well you might say "no holds barred". First there was what you

might expect: lectures, screenings of Soviet documentaries, participation in pro-Soviet demonstrations such as "Stalingrad Day" or "Red Army Day". But to such classical methods "France-U.S.S.R." added pretty nearly anything you could imagine which would attract and entertain. I have seen announcements of country fairs, rod and line fishing contests, dances, outdoor bowling tournaments, picnics, and bicycle races organized by "France-U.S.S.R.", all of these activities aimed at recruiting Communist party members and vaunting the glories of life in the Soviet Union. Most effectively of all perhaps, "France-U.S.S.R." organized for the children of its adherents free summer camps: a fortnight on the Mediterranean seashore. A mother who lives in the smoky suburb of St. Denis or Ivry, who sees her son go off, pale, and sees him come back all brown and toasted after a fortnight in the Mediterranean sunshine—well, you can guess for what party she and all her family and friends will vote.

I dislike statistics but you should perhaps know that "France-U.S.S.R." claims a membership of some 150,000 to 175,000. With national headquarters in Paris and departmental offices in 57 of France's 90 departments, "France-U.S.S.R." also runs 1,452 regional offices. To be sure these vary in size from large business suites open six days a week to one room offices open on market day. But don't forget that 1,452 offices constitute a very impressive number of outlets for information about the great "friendly" power to the East.

And in all the operations of "France-U.S.S.R." you never meet a Russian. There are no Soviet members on the board of directors, no Russian employees. They are all French. That is their great strength.

I have gone into "France-U.S.S.R." at some length because I followed its activities quite closely in Paris, and because it is quite typical. And its national character, its use of Frenchmen only, bring us to the last and perhaps most formidable weapon in the Communist arsenal.

If the Soviet Union is the fountainhead of Communist propaganda, it is the Communist organization and the Communist press in each country which, far better than the Soviet publications themselves, publicize and advance the Communist cause, all for the greater glory of the Soviet Union.

The Communist papers are not Russian. They are not spreading Russian propaganda. Perish the thought! They are militant organs fighting for the best interests of the Italian—or Swedish—or French proletariat. And by this token their acceptance is greater both when they extol the virtues of the Soviet paradise and when they damn the imperialist, the trust-ridden, the uncultured, the utterly despicable capitalist country: the U.S.A.

Of other, more devious, methods such as "front" groups, semipolitical groups, philanthropic societies, one could give hundreds of examples. At still other more occult devices, the rumor campaign, the whisper, the smear, one can guess. But they can but add to the full-throated chorus of the Soviet and non-Soviet Communist press, radio, lecturer, loud-speaker; the big drums and the piccolo and the throaty cello together form a mighty roar.

Well, what do we do about it? What is America's answer to Communist propaganda abroad?

I should not like this to sound like an attempt at a paradox, but America *is* the answer to Communist propaganda abroad.

The existence of this country is the answer, in so far as this country is known.

What is the target of Communist propaganda? The hungry and the cold, the tired and the discouraged people of the world are the natural targets of Communist propaganda. To these men and women, racked by war, weary and hopeless, a new economic system is offered. The police-state methods? Bah! Malicious lies! Join the Communist Party and you shall be led along the road toward a morrow full of music. Can't you feel the appeal of such slogans to those who cry: "it will be a change", and "nothing could be worse than the present"?

And yet to these same weary millions the word *America* has long shone as a symbol of hope, as a sun piercing the darkness of their frightened night. Yes, to be sure, it is a very distant sun, a far-off hope. The land of miracles is far, far away, difficult to imagine, almost impossible to reach. It is seen as through a glass, darkly. But America stands for freedom. Who would not like to know America?

How do we Americans satisfy this desire for knowledge, how do we answer the slurs and slanders which are daily poured out against us?

First of all, I am glad to say, we don't answer the slurs directly. Direct answers to hostile propaganda put the answerer on the defensive. They put him on to his adversaries' terrain. They are a sign of weakness, not of strength.

During the war, at the request of the Allied air forces, British and American propagandists taunted the Germans: "*Wo ist die Luftwaffe?*" (Where is the Luftwaffe?) The Allies wanted them to come up and be destroyed before the Normandy landings. The campaign aroused such doubts among the German listeners that Goebbels himself felt constrained to speak out, to explain, as best he could, the Luftwaffe's absence from the skies of battle. That day the broadcasters of the BBC and of the Voice of America knew that this campaign at least had been successful. And the interrogations of prisoners of war soon showed that Goebbels' retorts and denials had reassured no one; that, on the contrary, they

had left the German listeners more persuaded than before that all was not well with their air force.

Instructed by this and a dozen other such experiences, we do not answer Communist slander, tit for tat, we do not get involved in the vain arguments—"true; not true; you lie; I don't". Our aim (and when I say "we" I am thinking of Americans in Government or in private information work; of Embassies and of American newspaper offices abroad), our aim is, broadly speaking, to show the fair face of this country, of our people, and to let the true picture of America tell the story.

Who engages in such efforts? What agencies or groups contribute to our information work abroad?

News is, I suppose, the prime vehicle for such information and American news does get abroad, both in its written and in its visual forms. The great American news agencies, the picture agencies, the newsreel companies, certain American magazines with overseas and in some cases foreign-language editions, all these contribute to a projection of the American scene for foreign readers and spectators. American books, too, the technical books showing our progress in every field of human endeavor, the books on our social, economic, and political life, are a strong weapon in the conflict of ideas.

But all these media labor under difficulties, some peculiar to the postwar world of 1948 and others inherent in our very own way of life.

News agencies and magazines and papers and newsreels and publishing houses in a free economy must make money. And the currencies of many countries are in such a weakened condition that dollars cannot be found to buy American books or to subscribe to American magazines. Yet these commercial organizations have little use for large balances in guilder or lire or francs. Moreover in many countries, curtained off behind that iron screen, these vehicles of American thought cannot circulate regardless of whether there is or is not an available dollar balance.

Furthermore the nature of the American press and American publications is such that the very idea of propaganda is foreign to them. In the very long-term view this is, without doubt, sane and healthy. But the short-term need for an immediate reaction against Communist propaganda is not readily met by agencies to which objectivity and impartial news treatment are cardinal principles.

Then there are the films. Are these the answer? I remember of what city I am today a guest and I speak with circumspection. In other countries millions of people every week see the American films and for millions each one of the pictures is, indeed, one of the rays of that sun of hope, America. I should hesitate to say that every American film is a good ambassador. Some of them, in fact,

sow curious and regrettable misconceptions, chiefly because the foreign audiences lack knowledge about the U.S.A. and its ways. But the aggregate impact of American films is certainly a contributing factor and one of no mean importance in the total presentation of the life, thought, and activities of the United States. The films, however important as they are, are also subject to quota restrictions, to dollar currency shortages, and to actual censorship here and there.

All these different difficulties at present attendant upon private efforts to portray our way of life abroad and thereby to destroy the myths and stereotypes carefully fostered, when they are not invented, by the Communist organizations will explain why the United States Government has felt it desirable to establish and maintain a service devoted to the spreading of information about the United States; to the exchange of people, of educators, students, technicians, physicians, and administrators; to spread the truth about our policies, our national aims and our way of life, a service complementary to the efforts of private enterprise.

Acts, of course, speak more eloquently than words. The European Recovery Plan, Marshall Plan, Economic Cooperation Administration, call it what you like, has brought home to many millions the real aims of our foreign policy.

But even acts must be made known, and correctly known. To baptize the Marshall Plan as a new and devilish device of "American Economic Imperialism" designed to subjugate the countries of Europe and to colonize them in favor of the Wall Street barons was one of the first moves of the Communists everywhere.

To combat this and all other attacks on the United States and to destroy even among our friends the misconceptions so prevalent about our country is the task of U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Services throughout the world.

These services operate through what I earlier described as the traditional or classical media of press, radio, and films, through the exchange of persons, and through the use of books and exhibits.

My examples have, as I quite realize, been drawn very largely if not exclusively from France, since I had the honor of serving there myself so recently. Let me once more describe the operation of our services in France, with the remark that similar operations, varying in size and scope and opportunity, are being conducted by the Department of State at some 130 posts in 82 countries throughout the world.

One of the essential tasks of the mission is to obtain full and fair treatment of American news in the local press. To this end a service of some 5,000 words daily is radioed from Washington to Paris (as it is throughout the world). In Paris it is taken "off the air", translated into French and distributed in the form of a daily bulletin to 2,000

French addressees, about half of them newspaper and periodical editors, the other half being composed of educators, members of Parliament, government officials, trade-union leaders, doctors, lawyers—in short, the leaders of public opinion. This radioed material is backed up by air-mailed features and articles, reprints from American magazines, still pictures, exhibits, accounts of our progress in every field, explanations of our national policy. Such output is used extensively by the French press, particularly in the provinces. It does not compete with the private American news agencies, since the government output is not geared for "spot news" but deals with either full texts of American Government pronouncements or with materials which no private agency would find commercially profitable. (I should like to add that when I speak of American Government, I use this term in its widest sense, and refer to coverage of the activities of the Congress, of the Executive Branch and, on occasion, of the individual States.)

Documentary motion pictures, bought or borrowed from other Government agencies, from colleges and industry and other private groups are shown throughout France. They are pictures of American life, they show the American home, the skills and techniques of our professional men and women. And they show in France to some 750,000 people every month. World-wide audiences are in the nature of 102 million yearly.

In Paris and, shortly, in five cities in the provinces United States Information Service provides a reference library on American matters. The Paris library receives an average of 175 visitors daily, and approximately 80 percent of these visitors are scholars, government employees, physicians, and research workers. I should add that many points in the world outdo by far the Paris record in this respect. In the Philippines, for instance, the United States Library receives about 500 visitors daily.

A radio officer in Paris represents there the Voice of America and has arranged for the local rebroadcast of our New York produced show over one of the French networks with 14 stations, covering the whole of France. In this respect we are privileged, since we are the only country to enjoy a regular half-hour relay, seven days a week. "France-U.S.S.R." has two quarter-hour shows, weekly, against America's seven half-hour shows—a proportion of 7 to 1. And beside his function of liaison between the Voice of America and Radio Diffusion Française, the radio officer produces local shows himself on an average of 18 every month, featuring American music, travelogues, and aspects of our national folk ways.

Finally, on the educational side, a cultural officer and his assistants pursue the manifold duties that his very title suggests: lectures, advice to French professors, fellows, students en route for

the U.S.A.; assistance to American students, painters, musicians arriving to study in France; the organization of Franco-American seminars for teachers of English. These seminars, by the way, reveal the most surprising areas of ignorance. At one of them my wife, who was attending a round table, was seriously told by a French teacher: "I can't understand what American women can do all day long! You all have laundry machines, dishwashing machines, your children are never at home. Since there is no family life, and you cook everything out of cans, what do you do the rest of the time?"

This was a picture of the operation of your Government's information service in France. With local differences similar activities are carried out in the other countries of both hemispheres and these activities are still being developed. For instance, Public Law 402 authorizes in the Eastern Hemisphere exchange-of-persons activities already in effect in the Western Hemisphere. No funds were voted for this in the Eastern Hemisphere in the current fiscal year, but the program is foreseen as a nearing possibility.

There are two phases of the information work, upon which my Paris outline could not touch and which I must add to give you a rounded picture.

The Voice of America in New York broadcasts in 14 languages and its programs are boosted by relay points at Munich, at Manila and, by arrangement with the BBC, in England. I suppose most people have heard of the Voice. Whenever it has had the misfortune, in the outpouring of its vast daily output, to make a slip, the attendant publicity has been tremendous. Less, of course, was said about 50 effective programs than about one "off the beam." It is however comforting to us to know from our colleagues of the American Embassy at Moscow that the "Voice" in Russian, for instance, is widely listened to in the Soviet Union and that, again according to reports from the field, we are striking just about the right note by not taking personal issue with any of the Soviet "great ones", by avoiding all name calling which might provoke national pride and resentment but by maintaining a truthful, cool, and slightly ironical attitude about Soviet institutions which seems to appeal to the wry sense of humor of the Soviet listener. I admit that the appraisal of the quality of our output to Russia is based on the opinions of a very few. But, you see, we cannot be scientifically informed about our success in the U.S.S.R. for there are no public-opinion polls available to us in the Soviet Union.

The magazine *Amerika* is the last point I should like to mention. This Russian-language magazine published in New York by the State Department's Office of International Information, is sold in the U.S.S.R.; 50,000 copies monthly are distributed

through the Soviet News Agency. It is a large, heavily illustrated, colorful magazine which deals with noncontroversial aspects of American life. Its 50,000 copies are a very small drop in a large ocean but we know that many copies of the magazine circulate from hand to hand until they drop to pieces.

There is the picture: A Communist country and Communist parties in many countries join in a shrill, hysterical chorus: America is brutal, America is money-mad, America is standardized, uncultured, imperialistic, war mongering, fickle, unstable, headed toward disaster.

With more restraint and with less ample resources the Voices of America answer throughout the world: America is peace-loving; America seeks no aggrandizement; America is made up of 145 million people who hope, who fear, who struggle and love and live and die much as you do. We have common problems, but we have one inestimable treasure, which we are willing to share but for the defense of which (our history proves it) we are willing to die. That treasure is our freedom.

Who is winning in this struggle for the minds of men? My opinion is that truth is on the march. But America's answer will be convincing only if that answer is steadfastly truthful. Ideas are not defeated by the weight of arms or by material resources. The Christian idea was triumphant against the overwhelming might of the Roman Empire because of faith. When appraising the Communist attack let us not forget that if among its leaders there are rogues and self-seeking men lusting for power, there are also in the ranks men and women for whom that economic system and that theory of social organization replace God, fatherland, and family. It is in the measure that we can match and surpass that fanatical faith with an even more passionate belief in and support of our own freedoms that America may find the true answer to Communist propaganda.

Berlin Elections Demonstrate Civic Courage

Statement by the Department of State

[Released to the press December 6]

The Berlin population has in recent months demonstrated a type of civic courage which has won for it the admiration of the democratic peoples of the world. The wholehearted participation of an overwhelming majority of the population of the Western sectors of Berlin in fair and free municipal elections yesterday was a further demonstration of the same civic courage. The conduct of the people of Berlin is an encouragement to all those devoted to the maintenance of civil liberties and democratic processes.

Austrian Federal Government Asks for Continuation of Peace Treaty Negotiations

[Released to the press December 7]

A note was received from the Austrian Federal Government on December 6 pointing out that no progress had been made in the preparation of the Austrian treaty since the conference of the Deputies of the Council of Foreign Ministers was adjourned in London in May of this year. The note stated that the Austrian Government, as well as the Austrian people, are most anxious for the speedy conclusion of the treaty, which would bring about the withdrawal of the occupation forces of the Four Powers and the elimination of the division of Austria into four zones. The Austrian Government considered that the Four Power occupation was an impediment to Austria's economic recovery. The request was made of the Government of the United States jointly with the other Governments represented in the Council of Foreign Ministers to resume their negotiations in order to bring about an early conclusion of the treaty. Similar notes have been addressed to the Governments of Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

The Department of State has replied to the Austrian note welcoming the initiative which the Austrian Federal Government has shown and expressing the hope that a suitable basis might be found for the continuation of negotiations and the early conclusion of the treaty. The Austrian Government was informed that the United States is fully prepared to participate in renewed discussions on the Austrian treaty. As soon as the replies of the other Governments are received the United States Deputy on the Council of Foreign Ministers, as chairman of the next meeting, will address an appropriate communication to the Secretary General of the Council of Foreign Ministers.

Participation in Venezuelan Political Affairs by U.S. Petroleum Companies Denied

[Released to the press December 8]

Charges have appeared in the press that United States petroleum companies backed the military group which recently overthrew the Government of President Rómulo Gallegos in Venezuela.

At least two American petroleum companies are reported by the press to have already issued statements denying any intervention in Venezuelan internal affairs. The Department of State knows of no evidence or indications of any kind which would give the slightest support to such charges.

As far as is known to the Department American companies and other entities represented in Venezuela avoided participation of any kind in the Venezuelan revolution of last month. Americans residing abroad have repeatedly been warned that

interference in the domestic political affairs of foreign states may result in the withdrawal of United States Government protection, and the Department takes this opportunity of reiterating and emphasizing this injunction.

U.S. Military Attaché in Venezuela Impartial in Domestic Situation

[Released to the press December 10]

A United Press report from Habana dated December 9, 1948, quotes Romulo Gallegos, exiled President of Venezuela, as "demanding" that the United States Government explain the presence of its military attaché at the Caracas army barracks during the military revolt of November 24. Señor Gallegos is further quoted as having stated that the military attaché of the United States acted as "cooperator or counselor" for the revolutionists.

According to information received from the American Ambassador in Caracas, the military attaché of the United States, Col. Edward F. Adams, did visit the Ministry of National Defense on November 24. The purpose of this visit was to inquire if there was any news from our air attaché at Caracas who a few days earlier had left for a sparsely populated region of Venezuela known as the Gran Sabana to search for a lost United States military plane. No word had been received from him, giving rise to serious concern.

Despite the political crisis it was not felt advisable to defer this inquiry because of the nature of the emergency. Shortly after noon the same day Colonel Adams visited the Presidential Palace, Miraflores, on the same errand. There he met Venezuelan officers of his acquaintance who confirmed an earlier radio report that the Army had taken over the Government. The American Ambassador has informed the Department that Colonel Adams has stated categorically that in none of his conversations did he indicate any partiality for either side involved in the political crisis or give any advice or express opinions which could be interpreted as constituting intervention in Venezuelan domestic affairs.

It is regretted that Señor Gallegos, not knowing the emergency reasons for the visits of Colonel Adams to the Ministry of Defense and the Presidential Palace on November 24, concluded that they had some other purpose, even though Señor Gallegos cannot but be aware of the record of this Government in adhering strictly to its nonintervention commitments. Standing instructions of the Department to all its missions prescribe that officials of this Government must not intervene in the internal political affairs of any foreign government. There is no basis for belief that any member of the Embassy staff failed to live up to this standing injunction during the recent political crisis in Venezuela.

Conversations on Security Problems of North Atlantic

[Released to the press December 10]

The Acting Secretary of State this afternoon conferred with the Ambassadors of Belgium, Canada, France, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, and the Minister of Luxembourg in a continuation of the talks, begun in July, on security problems of common interest in relation to the Senate Resolution of June 11, 1948. The conversations had been recessed in September to give the Governments an opportunity to consider the tentative views which had been developed. The resumed conversations are expected to continue for some time and no information concerning their substance will be made public until such time as decisions may be reached.

President of Cuba Visits In the United States

Statement Upon Departure by Acting Secretary Lovett

[Released to the press December 11]

The friendly relations between the United States and Cuba have greatly benefited by the visit of Dr. Carlos Prío. The President of Cuba carries with him our best wishes as he returns home.

In the course of President Prío's visit it became apparent that the two countries are seeking common objectives and that there exists a mutual desire to cooperate in practical ways towards achieving these common ideals.

The United States is prepared to do all that it can to work with Cuba in reinforcing the social and economic basis on which true cooperation must rest.

Remarks by President Truman¹

I am very happy to welcome you, President Prío, to the United States. No two countries of this closely knit Hemisphere have been bound together more closely than the Republic of Cuba and the United States. The friendly bond between them was forged in a common struggle for freedom, and it has continued through all the trials of two world wars and through the many other problems in the political and economic growth of our two countries. There is no relationship which better typifies the firm solidarity of the American States than the traditionally cordial collaboration between Cuba and the United States.

¹ Made upon the arrival of the Cuban President at the National Airport on Dec. 8, 1948, and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

Mr. President, I have been looking forward to your arrival, as have all the many friends of Cuba in this country, and we sincerely hope that you will thoroughly enjoy your all too brief stay in the United States.

The President To Recommend Relief for Palestine Refugees

[Released to the press by the White House December 7]

The President, following adoption by the United Nations General Assembly on November 19 of a resolution for assistance to Palestine refugees, will recommend to Congress that the United States contribute 50 percent of the amount provided for in this resolution, but in no case more than a total of \$16,000,000 as the share of the United States.

The resolution of the General Assembly, adopted at its 163d plenary meeting on November 19, 1948, considered that a sum of approximately \$29,500,000 will be required to provide relief for 500,000 refugees for a period of nine months from December 1, 1948, to August 31, 1949, and that an additional amount of approximately \$2,500,000 will be required for administrative and local operational expenses.

The recommendation of the President to Congress for an amount not to exceed \$16,000,000 will be made in the earnest hope that other countries will meet the remainder of the total required.

The American Delegation to the United Nations Assembly has emphasized that in accordance with constitutional requirements the President's recommendation for an appropriation of \$16,000,000 for Palestinian refugee relief must be accepted by the Congress before any funds become available. The final decision rests with it. The recommendation will be transmitted to the Congress after it convenes in January.

Economic Cooperation Agreement With Korea Signed

Negotiators representing the Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Korea signed an aid agreement at Seoul on December 10, 1948 (Seoul time).

Taking cognizance of the inauguration of the Government of the Republic of Korea on August 15, 1948, and the termination on that date of United States Army military government in Korea, President Truman on August 23, 1948, announced that he had instructed the Economic Cooperation Administrator to make preparations to take over responsibility for the United States economic aid program in Korea within a few months.

The agreement signed at Seoul on December 10, which is being submitted to the Korean National Assembly for ratification, provides the framework within which the economic assistance requested of the United States by the Republic of Korea will be carried out by the Department of the Army and by the Economic Cooperation Administration when the latter assumes these responsibilities. By strengthening the economy of Korea through the economic aid to be furnished under this agreement, the United States will be maintaining its support for the independence of Korea which has been furthered by action of the United Nations. The agreement was signed on behalf of the United States by the Special United States Representative in Korea, Ambassador John J. Muccio, and on behalf of the Republic of Korea by Prime Minister Lee Bum Suk and Finance Minister Kim Do Yun. For text of the aid agreement see press release 999 dated December 10, 1948, of the Department of State and the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Consular Convention Between U.S. and Republic of the Philippines Proclaimed

[Released to the press December 7]

On November 26, 1948, the President of the United States proclaimed the consular convention between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Manila on March 14, 1947. This convention, which reaffirms the desire of both countries to strengthen further relations between them by facilitating the handling of consular matters, entered into force on November 18, 1948, by virtue of the exchange on that date of the respective instruments of ratification.

The convention establishes a formal reciprocal basis for the exchange of consular officers between the two countries and defines their rights and duties, covering such matters as privileges and immunities with respect to taxation and import duties, responsibilities and authority in the settlement of decedents' estates, representation of nationals, authentication and notarization of documents, and shipping and merchant marine problems such as salvage and personnel. The rights of each country to acquire land for official purposes is also covered.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Advisory Committee of the Foreign Service Institute Established

[Released to the press December 8]

An advisory committee of leading American citizens has been set up by the Secretary of State to guide and advise the Foreign Service Institute in its training of Department of State and Foreign Service personnel overseas, the Department of State announced on December 8.

December 19, 1948

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

This committee, known as the Advisory Committee of the Foreign Service Institute, will assemble in Washington for its first annual meeting on December 17, at which time it will review the program of the institute and its plans for the future.

The Director General of the Foreign Service, Christian M. Ravndal, will serve as chairman of the committee. Other members are:

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts
 Senator Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico
 Congressman Bartel J. Jonkman, of Michigan
 Congressman John Kee, of West Virginia
 Charles E. Bohlen, Counselor, Department of State
 Joseph C. Grew, former Under Secretary of State
 John S. Dickey, President of Dartmouth College
 Gardner Cowles, President, *Des Moines Register and Tribune* Company
 Prof. Graham H. Stuart, Stanford University
 Ralph T. Reed, President, American Express Company

The two senatorial members of the committee were nominated by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the two House members by the Speaker. Other members were named by the Secretary of State.

The Foreign Service Institute was created by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 "in order to furnish training and instruction to officers and employees of the Foreign Service and of the Department of State and to other officers and employees of the Government for whom training and instruction in the field of foreign relations is necessary, and in order to promote and foster programs of study incidental to such training."

The Institute was formally established on March 13, 1947. Dr. William P. Maddox is its Director. It occupies a building at 2115 C Street, NW.

PUBLICATIONS

Department of State

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Health and Sanitation Cooperative Program in Haiti. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1801. Pub. 3324. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement Between the United States and Haiti extending the agreement of April 7, 1942, as amended, until June 30, 1949—Effected by exchange of notes signed at Port-au-Prince June 25 and 30, 1948; entered into force June 30, 1948.

United States Educational Foundation in New Zealand. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1812. Pub. 3327. 7 pp. 5¢.

Agreement Between the United States and New Zealand—Signed at Wellington September 14, 1948; entered into force September 14, 1948.

Contents

The United Nations and Specialized Agencies	Page
General Assembly Adopts Declaration of Human Rights:	
Statement by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt	751
Text of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights	752
Closing of General Assembly. Statement by Ambassador Warren R. Austin	754
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee Resolution on Admission of New Members	754
General Assembly Adopts Convention on Genocide:	
Statement by Ernest A. Gross	755
Resolution of Approval and Text of Convention	756
U.S. Urges Continuation of Temporary Commission on Korea. Statement by John Foster Dulles in Committee I	758
Text of Joint Resolution	760
U.S. Position on Unanimity Principle of the Charter. Statement by Benjamin V. Cohen in <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee	761
The United States in the United Nations	763
Report on the First Session of the General Council of Iro. Article by George L. Warren	765
Iro Preparatory Commission: Seventh Session	767
Occupation Matters	
U.S. Suspends Consideration of Proposal for Japanese Deconcentration of Finances and Industry. Statement by General Frank R. McCoy	768
Conduct of Trade With Japan	770

Occupation Matters—Continued	Page
Travel Abroad of Japanese Commercial Representatives	771
Berlin Elections Demonstrate Civic Courage	776
Austrian Federal Government Asks for Continuation of Peace Treaty Negotiations	777
Treaty Information	
Austrian Federal Government Asks for Continuation of Peace Treaty Negotiations	777
Economic Cooperation Agreement With Korea Signed	778
Consular Convention Between U.S. and Republic of the Philippines Proclaimed	779
International Information and Cultural Affairs	
America's Answer to Communist Propaganda Abroad. Address by Douglas Schneider	772
General Policy	
Participation in Venezuelan Political Affairs by U.S. Petroleum Companies Denied	777
U.S. Military Attaché in Venezuela Impartial in Domestic Situation	777
Conversations on Security Problems of North Atlantic	778
President of Cuba Visits in the United States: Statement by Acting Secretary Lovett	778
Remarks by President Truman	778
Economic Affairs	
The President To Recommend Relief for Palestine Refugees	778
The Foreign Service	
Advisory Committee of the Foreign Service Institute Established	779
Publications	
Department of State	779

Contributors

George L. Warren, author of the articles on the Iro, is Adviser on Refugees and Displaced Persons, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Occupied Areas, Department of State. Mr. Warren served as Alternate U.S. Representative to the First Session of the Council of the International Refugee Organization, and as U.S. Representative to the Preparatory Commission.